



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,852	12/28/1999	EUGENE M. BETZ	8131	9285

26890 7590 03/07/2003

JAMES M. STOVER
NCR CORPORATION
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4
DAYTON, OH 45479

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/472,852

Applicant(s)

BETZ ET AL.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 1/13/2003, paper no. 10.
2. Claims 1,5,15,17-19 have been amended, paper no. # 10.
3. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.
4. In view of applicant's amendment to Claim 1, the rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as set forth in the previous office action paper no. # 8 is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 12/28/1999 are objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152, formal drawings are required in response to this office action, paper no. # 11

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement filed on 4/30/2000, paper no. # 5 has been considered, a copy of PTO-1449 herewith enclosed with this office action, paper no.8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1- 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukhopadhyay et al., [hereafter Mukhopadhyay], US Patent No. 6032158 in view of Bair et al., [hereafter Bair], US Patent No. 6067523.

8. As to Claim 1, Mukhopadhyay teaches a system which including 'a computer implemented method of capturing and recording changes to an electronic data warehouse or data mart' [see fig 1-2, Abstract], capturing and recording changes to an electronic data warehouse or data mart corresponds to fig 1, element 105-106,

'soliciting a user for data discovery information defining data and sources of the data for a data warehouse or data mart' [col 4, line 39-48], CDC database may contain various database tables such as log record table, image tables transaction tables and like, further user designates one source table in the mapping to be the primary source table as detailed in col 4, line 47-48, defining data corresponds to what data should be captured from the source tables of the operational databases element 201-202 as detailed in col 4, line 9-12, 'documenting at least a portion of f the data warehouse or data mart in an SOR (system of record) document' [col 4, line 58-67, col 5, line 1-5], SOR corresponds to table 1 because table 1 specifically directed to various system of records such as server and database id's, 'incorporating at least a portion of the discovery information recorded in the SOR database' [col 6, line 61-67], It is however, noted that Mukhopadhyay does not specifically teach 'generating a user customized document'. On the other hand, Bair teaches a system which including 'generating a user customized document' [fig 3-4, col 8, line 32-36, line 58-67], customized document corresponds to individual patient's record.

• It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Bair et al., into capturing and propagating changes from an operational database to data marts of Mukhopadhyay because they both are directed to data storing in one or more databases, more specifically Mukhopadhyay teaches capturing and propagating changes made upon an operational database to one or more target data marts [see col 1, line 7-12], while Bair

Art Unit: 2177

is directed to creating displaying, reports for aggregating data from patient treatment results, more specifically optimization system and method for integrating patient data, electronically communicating selected information to a data collection center for amassing a database of behavioral treatment, displaying treatment goals and like as detailed in col 2, line 52-58]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Mukhopadhyay's capturing and propagating changes from an operational database to data marts to control which relative combinations of individual patient's database satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Bair et al., [col 3, see 41-46].

9. As to Claim 2, Bair teaches a system which including 'presenting a predefined sequence of queries' [col 8, line 18-27, fig 3], 'set of predefined templates stored in the SOR database' [col 8, line 49-55, fig 4], 'associating user provided answers to the queries with respective ones of the templates' [col 9, line 18-24].

10. As to Claim 3, Bair teaches a system which including 'generating an exception when the user answers a query out of sequence with the predefined sequence of queries and thereby creates at least one unanswered query' [col 12, line 3-22], 'storing the exception in an exception table and associating the exception with the at least one unanswered query' [col 12, line 30-34].

11. As to Claim 4, Bair teaches a system which including 'presenting a list of exceptions and associated unanswered queries to the user, to thereby inform the user of the need to collect further discovery information' [col 12, line 35-55].

12. As to Claims 5, 9-10, Bair teaches a system which including 'extracting a selected portion of the SOR database from the SOR database and storing the extracted portion in a computer memory workspace' [col 13, line 26-31], 'visualizing the extracted portion residing in the workspace on the computer display' [fig 17-20], 'customizing an order of presentation and an output format of the visualized, extracted portion residing in the workspace' [col 13, line 56-67].

13. As to Claim 6, Bair teaches a system which including 'presenting a list of the SOR templates to the user' [col 8, line 49-57], "selecting one or more of the SOR templates from the list of SOR templates' [col 8, line 58-60], 'extracting the selected templates and associated discovery information from the SOR database to establish the extracted portion of the SOR database in the workspace' col 9, line 18-24].

14. As to Claims 7-8, Bair teaches a system which including 'database includes predefined output formats associated with generating the customized document, and wherein said generating step includes the further step of formatting the extracted portion in accordance with the output formats' [col 13, line 60-67].

15. As to Claim 11, Mukhopadhyay teaches a system which including 'names of source databases and source files providing a source of data to the data warehouse' [col 3, line 65-67, col 4, line 1-4], 'descriptions of the source databases and files' col 4, line 58-67], 'logical data models for the source databases and files and for the data residing in the databases and files' [fig 3], 'locations of the source databases and files including identifier' [col 4, line 47-52]. On the other hand, Bair teaches names and contact information relating to administrators' [col 3, line 1-11], 'updating frequency of the source databases and files' [col 7, line 33-35], 'data transferring methods and frequencies' [col 7, line 28-31, line 45-46], 'volatility rules for the data' [col 7, line 49-55], 'business rationales for using the data' [col 7, line 53-55].

16. As to Claim 12, Bair teaches a system which including 'importing discovery information in the form of at least one of data files' [col 7, line 24-39], 'linking the imported discovery information' [col 8, line 42-48].

17. As to Claim 13, Bair teaches a system which including 'recording configuration control information in the SOR database each time the SOR database is updated' [col 6, line 66-67, col 7, line 1-12].

18. As to Claim 14, Bair teaches a system which including 'uploading the SOR database to a database residing in a network accessible computer' [col 7, line 1-3], network corresponds to LAN element 320.

19. As to Claim 15, Bair teaches a system which including 'document that defines the starting system parameters' [see fig 25], Mukhopadhyay teaches 'data warehouse' [fig 1, element 106].

20. As to Claim 16, Mukhopadhyay teaches 'logical data model, physical data model, metadata' [see fig 1-3], while Bair teaches 'configuration templates' [col 8, line 49-55].

21. As to Claim 17, Mukhopadhyay teaches a system which including 'updating the SOR database including modifications to the data warehouse' [col 1, line 63-66].

22. As to Claim 18, Mukhopadhyay teaches a system which including 'synchronizing the SOR' [col 3, line 60-65, fig 2].

23. As to Claim 19, Bair teaches a system which including 'inputting data discovery information either manually or automatically' [fig 4].

24. As to Claim 20, Bair teaches a system which including 'discovery information includes at least one of text, audio, image, and video' [see fig 29-30].

25. As to Claim 21, Bair teaches a system which including 'customized document includes at least one of text, audio, images and video' [fig 29-30].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/13/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For the examiner's response, see the discussion below:

26. At page 4, line 2-3, Claim 1, applicant argues 'there is no teaching or suggestion or consideration of generating a user customized document'

As to the above argument, examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Bair et al is directed to collecting and reporting data from various sources, more specifically, providing health care data that including integrating patient chart, previous treatment, and treatment plan information and like [col 1, line 6-8, col 2, line 41-45], secondly, Bair specifically directed to customized document or questionnaires and the cross-referencing of results [col 2, line 59-62], thirdly, Bair specifically teaches to create a specific document or customized documents based on unique ID or patient SSN as detailed in fig 3 element 514 that related to the patient module element 322 [col 8, line 32-36, line 58-67]. As best understood by the examiner, customized document corresponds to individual patient's electronic chart or record or document.

Art Unit: 2177

27. At page 4, Claim 2, Bair does not teach or suggest presenting a predefined sequence of queries for the discovery information.....

As to the above argument, Examiner disagree with the applicant because Bair specifically teaches for example patient information database that containing predefined sequence of entering data such as detailed in fig 3 for queries, further Bair also teaches specifically predefined template such as detailed in fig 4, also it is noted that queries or search can be performed through search box element 519 [col 8, line 30-31].

28. At page 4, Claim 3, Bair does not teach or suggest generating an exception when the user and is a query out-of sequence.....

29. At page 4, Claim 4, Bair does not teach or suggest a system which presents a list of exceptions.....

As to the above arguments, Bair specifically suggest for example questionnaire template element 66 that contains various topic list, when the topic is selected, it gives user(s) guided entry question box such as detailed in fig 17, element 664, further it is also noted that list of answers are provided in the answer box [see fig 17 element 665-666] that corresponds to predefined sequence of queries, in other words predefined questions and related answers, N/A feature specifically directed to answer does not apply as detailed in col 12, line 20-22.

Art Unit: 2177

30. At page 5, Claims 5,9-10, Bair does not teach or suggest generating a user customized document.....

As to the above argument, As best understood by the examiner, Bair specifically teaches each patient electronic chart, setting up of templates, customizing patient data [see fig 3-4], further Bair also teaches searching or querying specific data and displaying as detailed in fig 3. It is also noted that Bair teaches visualizing and displaying question and related answers [col 12, line 11-22, col 13, line 50-67].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6032158
- b. US Patent No. 6067523

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

- c. US Patent No. 6363393
- d. US Patent No. 6243703
- e. US Patent No. 6363391
- f. US Patent No. 6178418
- g. US Patent No. 6163774
- h. US Patent No. 6167405
- i. US Patent No. 6151586
- j. US Patent No. 6035330
- k. EP0703537
- l. EP0706140

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	(After Final Communication)
703/746-7239	(Offical Communications)
703/746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)
(703) 308-6606	(Art Unit)

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

SC 
Patent Examiner.
March 6, 2003.

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER